Exhibit 5

Page 508

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA CHARLESTON DIVISION

IN RE: ETHICON, INC. : Master File No.

PELVIC REPAIR SYSTEM,

: 2:12-MD-02327

PRODUCTS LIABILITY

: MDL NO. 2327

LITIGATION

AND VARIOUS OTHER CROSS-NOTICED ACTIONS THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO ALL CASES

> June 4, 2013 VOLUME III

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER Continued Videotaped 30(b)(6) deposition of DANIEL J. SMITH taken pursuant to notice, was held at the law offices of Riker Danzig

Scherer Hyland & Perretti LLP, Headquarters Plaza, One Speedwell Avenue, Morristown, New Jersey, beginning at 9:48 a.m., on the above date, before Ann Marie Mitchell, a Federally Approved Certified Realtime Reporter, Registered Diplomate Reporter and Notary Public for the State of New Jersey.

> GOLKOW TECHNOLOGIES, INC. 877.370.3377 ph|917.951.5672 fax deps@golkow.com

```
Page 661
    it says "Acceptable risk." Do you see that?
1
                    Yes.
2
            Α.
                    So that means that that would be an
3
            Q.
    acceptable risk and that there would be no further
4
5
     follow-up. Correct?
                    It means that for that RPN, it would
6
    be low enough that we wouldn't say change the device
7
     or that the procedure had to be passed in that
8
    particular location, and it was acceptable, you
 9
     know. Yeah, acceptable risk.
10
                    If you go to page 523, one other
11
     entry I want to ask you about. Number 10, next to
12
13
     that --
                    One second, one second.
14
            Α.
                    Number 10?
15
                    Next to that, it says, under the
16
            Q.
     "Failure mode," it says, "Particles from Prolene
17
     mesh fall...into the tissue." Do you see that?
18
19
                    Yes.
            Α.
                    That was essentially --
20
            Q.
                     Before the laser cut mesh, that was
21
     one of the problems that was occurring with the
22
     mesh; is that right?
23
                     It could be considered a problem, but
24
     it wasn't a -- necessarily a very high risk problem.
25
```

```
Page 662
                    Well, under "Effect," it says, "No
1
            Q.
2
    effect. Implantable material." Do you see that?
3
                    Yes.
            Α.
                    As a corporate designee who has
4
            0.
     looked at the design history files in preparation
5
     for this deposition, do you know whether or not
 6
    Ethicon or Johnson & Johnson has ever done any
7
     studies specifically to determine whether those
8
     particles that would fall into the tissue had any
9
10
     clinical effect on a patient?
11
                    It's outside of my purview, but this
12
     is Prolene, which is a suture material used in
13
     cardiovascular surgery implanted in the body all the
     time, so I would say that from a suture perspective,
14
15
     it was studied.
16
                    But we're not talking about sutures,
            Q.
17
     we're talking about particles falling off the mesh
18
     tape in this case. Correct?
19
                    We're talking about Prolene fiber
20
     material, which is the same fiber material used in
21
     sutures.
22
                    But my question is a little
            Ο.
     different.
23
24
                    Do you know as you sit here today
25
     whether or not Ethicon or Johnson & Johnson did any
```

```
Page 663
    tests specifically to determine whether those
1
    particles falling into the tissue when they fell off
2
    the mesh during operations could cause any clinical
3
    problems for a patient, yes or no?
 4
                    MR. HUTCHINSON: I'm going to object
 5
 6
    to the extent that question exceeds the scope of the
7
     30(b)(6) notice.
                    THE WITNESS: From my understanding,
8
     since the entire mesh is made of Prolene and
 9
10
     implanted --
                    MR. CARTMELL: Okay. I'm going to
11
12
    object and move to strike.
                                     No, no, Tom.
13
                    MR. HUTCHINSON:
                    MR. CARTMELL: Yeah, we don't --
14
15
                    MR. HUTCHINSON:
                                     No.
                    MR. CARTMELL: We're not going to go
16
17
     on and --
                    MR. HUTCHINSON: Listen to me.
18
19
                    MR. CARTMELL: No, I'm not listening
20
     to you.
21
                    MR. HUTCHINSON: Well, then shut up
     and listen. The witness is entitled to continue
22
     answering your question and then you can reask the
23
24
     question.
25
                    MR. CARTMELL: But if my question had
```

```
Page 664
    been is Prolene going to cause a problem for a
1
    patient, then that would be an answer to my
2
    question. My question was, did the -- has the
3
    company ever done any studies. That's my only
4
     question. I know he wants to give your response,
5
    but my --
 6
                    MR. HUTCHINSON: It's not my
7
     response, it's his response.
8
                    MR. CARTMELL: -- question is very
 9
     specific. Okay?
10
11
                    MR. HUTCHINSON: Okay.
                    MR. CARTMELL: And all I'm asking --
12
13
    my specific question --
                    MR. HUTCHINSON:
14
                                     I'll qo.
15
                    The witness will answer the question
     that you asked and then you can ask a follow-up
16
17
     question.
18
                    Dan, you can finish answering the
19
     question.
     BY MR. CARTMELL:
20
21
                    Let me restate the question.
            Q.
22
                    As you sit here today as the
23
     corporate designee and having reviewed the files,
24
     the design history files, in preparation for this
25
     deposition, has Ethicon or Johnson & Johnson
```

```
Page 665
    performed any studies to determine whether or not
1
    the particles that fall off or did fall off the mesh
2
    TVT device caused any problems or issues from a
3
    clinical standpoint to patients, yes or no?
4
                    MR. HUTCHINSON: I'm going to object
5
    to the extent that question exceeds this person's
 6
    designation for the 30(b)(6) topics.
7
                    THE WITNESS: I have not seen in my
8
    review of the documents here that that study was in
9
10
    here.
    BY MR. CARTMELL:
11
12
                    Let me ask you a few questions about
     the instructions for use or the label for the TVT
13
14
    device.
                    When the TVT was first sold in the
15
     United States, who was it that actually developed
16
17
     and approved the label for the device?
                    Well, since it was before my time,
18
     but I can tell you that there's a labeling procedure
19
     and a copy review that I'm sure has been in place as
20
     it is today for all labeling, which would include
21
22
     the package label as well as the IFU.
23
                    And it's your understanding from your
     review of the design history files that the label
24
     that was first in use in 1998 when the product was
25
```

```
Page 789
1
    you see that?
2
            Α.
                   Yes, I believe I do.
 3
                    To the design history file, and then
            0.
     it has several 0s and a 176.
 4
5
                    And that is actually the design
     history file for the laser cut mesh design history
 6
7
     file. Right?
8
            Α.
                    I'd have to look at it to confirm it,
    but if you say it is.
 9
10
                    Well, you looked at that in
            Q.
11
     preparation for your depo. Right?
12
            Α.
                    Yes, but I don't remember numbers.
13
            0.
                    Fair enough. I'll represent to you
14
     that it was.
15
                    And we haven't talked much about the
16
     laser cut mesh change, but what was that
17
     specifically? In other words, why was the TVT
18
     product changed to have a laser cut mesh?
19
                    I believe in one of the earlier
20
     deposition days we spoke that the particle loss that
21
     we had was being presented by our competition as
22
     being a problem, although it wasn't necessarily a
     problem. So we created a laser cut mesh to minimize
23
24
     it, you know, but we never took off the mechanically
25
     cut mesh because it doesn't represent a problem
```

```
Page 790
    other than from a marketing perspective.
1
                    So I've seen references in the
2
            0.
    documents to fraying mesh.
3
                    Is that the -- when the mesh frays
4
5
     and particles fall off?
                    It's been called many things, but
 6
7
     yes.
                    And so there was a series of
8
            Q.
     complaints or there have been a series of complaints
 9
10
     over the years with the TVT device that the mesh
11
     would fray and that particles could fall off the
12
     mesh and into the patient's body. Correct?
13
            A.
                    That's correct.
14
            0.
                    And some doctors sent complaints to
15
     the company saying, you know, we don't like the fact
16
     that this -- these particles are falling into our
17
     patients, and voice of customer was they told you
18
     they would like to see a mesh that didn't do that.
19
     Correct?
20
                    And as a due diligence, we pursued it
21
     to create a laser cut mesh.
22
                    And as you said, that happened in
            Q.
23
     2006, or at least that's to the best of your memory?
24
            Α.
                    Somewhere in that ballpark.
25
                    That would be consistent with this
            Q.
```